



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In the passage beginning with l. 1478, it is difficult to understand Wülker's punctuation, especially his placing a full stop at the end of l. 1480. By this punctuation he has, I think, made the next two or three lines more difficult than before. But here, as in several other places, he has given us little clue to his understanding of the passage. I would call special attention to these: l. 375, *wædo gewætte*; l. 1159, *winræced*; l. 1169, *weriges*; l. 1173, *gefered*; l. 1266, *acol*, etc. In the first passage, l. 375, every editor has, I think, construed these words differently. In other places he has given the different opinions; cf. l. 742, *septe*; l. 819, *berede*; l. 942, *heafodmaga*; l. 999, *god, dryhtendom*, etc. All these words and passages will, it is true, be settled when the second edition of the *Sprachschatz* appears. But it seems to me a mistake to explain some and to omit others that require explanation just as much.

In numerous places in Wülker's notes attention is called to false readings in my edition. I have carefully compared every variation between his and my own readings, and I find that the following false readings were given me in the copy of the MS which he kindly furnished me: l. 37, *murndon*; l. 105, *tires*; l. 136, *hwæne*; l. 358, *sibbe*; l. 401, *agefon*; l. 439, *cunneðan*; l. 504, *sneorweð*; l. 556, *fruman*; l. 613, *forleole*; l. 663, *siðfæte*; l. 664, *elleffne*; l. 719, *Cheruphim 7 Seraphim* (MS *et*); l. 770, *alfæle*; l. 776, as MS, *ærenðu*; l. 801, *gewædon*; l. 859, *eade*; l. 987, *7 synfulra*. This character, I find, though placed just before *synfulra*, was intended to mark the end of a page (42 b) in the MS. l. 1074, *geleah*; l. 1154, *eann*, Wülker left this uncorrected in a copy of Kemble's edition which he corrected for my use, but supposing that it was an oversight, I did not give it as a MS reading; l. 1192, *þær se cyninga*; l. 1193, *nennðon*; l. 1338 Wülker omitted *on his mægolite* in the copy furnished me. Hence my note. l. 1381, *forhogodes*. There are seven other errors called attention to in his notes, for which I am responsible: l. 85, *scild hetum*; l. 143, *gleawne*; l. 479, *pinne*; l. 828, *ða þa*; l. 925, *ond-* (MS *and-*); l. 929, *meahte*; l. 1699, *blyssum*.

The proof-reading has been done and the references made with remarkable accuracy. Only the following few misprints and mistakes have been noticed: p. 23, l. 496 (note), B. accredited with two different readings for the same words; p. 26, l. 561 (note), *hearmwide*; p. 29, l. 620 (note), incorrect statement about B.'s punctuation; p. 33, l. 733 (note), *cyððe* twice for *cyððe*; p. 48, l. 103, incorrect statement made about *crunge*: cf. my edition; p. 66, l. 1376, *gescyldeð* for *gescilðeð*.

Let us hope that Prof. Wülker will give all his time to this work, till he has thoroughly revised both the *Bibliothek* and the *Sprachschatz*. All students of Old English are awaiting their revision with the greatest interest.

W. M. BASKERVILL.

Der Diphthong *eu* im griechischen unter Berücksichtigung seiner Entsprechungen in verwandten Sprachen, von HERBERT WEIR SMYTH, Ph. D. Göttingen, 1885.

In this diligently prepared paper Mr. Smyth has given a valuable contribution to the study of Greek vocalism, and especially to the study of Homeric forms, inasmuch as he has confined his treatment to the cases of *eu* that occur in Homer or in the old epic poetry, illustrating these at the same time by

inscriptions antedating 403 B. C. The questions that come up for discussion are many and varied, both as to difficulty and intrinsic importance. In some cases the author simply states the theories of others, especially when these are generally accepted; often he has explanations and suggestions of his own, in some cases of especial value, in all worthy of consideration; sometimes again he refuses to offer an explanation for questions that have puzzled every one working in the same field heretofore.

The Greek diphthong *ei* is of threefold origin: First, the original Indo-European diphthong in the row *oi, ei, ι*; second, the diphthong which has its origin in the separate and individual life of the Greek language out of *ε + ι*, these elements coming together in various ways; third, the spurious diphthong *ei* derived from contraction or compensative lengthening. In treating the first class, the recent investigations of Indo-European vocalism and ablaut are alluded to, but not discussed; it would seem, though, that the author has a bias for De Saussure's views, for, in his very first sentence, he derives *ē, ô, ā* from *ee, eo, ea*. This may be true or not, yet it is hardly made more acceptable by the author's defense on p. 6. Speaking of the development of diphthongs from long vowels, as O. H. G. *uo* < P. T. *ō*, he says: "Dass sich Diphthonge aus den reinen Längen haben entwickeln können, ist ein Beweis, dass diese reinen Längen ursprünglich diphthongischer Natur waren."

Pure possibilities afford but slight proof of actual linguistic phenomena. According to Mr. Smyth's own view (Am. Journ. Phil. VI, p. 420), the spurious diphthong *ei* derived from compensative lengthening assumed after 380 B. C. a diphthongal character. The English diphthong *ai* in *five* is of similar history, yet surely this later development is no proof of diphthongal origin. After this general introduction we are given a list of 69 groups of words showing the ablaut *oi, ei, ι*. The fullness with which kindred forms are cited from inscriptions is of the utmost value. Under the group *Feidenmai* the form *Πολύιδος* offers some difficulty, and the explanation the author suggests as lengthened under the ictus for *Πολύιδος*, he seems himself inclined to retract in Vol. VI, p. 440 of this Journal.

The second diphthong *ei*, originating out of *ε + ι*, brings up the question of *διάστασις* in Homer, which the author discusses very fully. The conclusion is reached that diaeresis occurs finally and medially in the case of *ες*-stems, with the exception of those words that form or contain a proceleusmaticus; in the case of *εν*-stems always finally, but failing often medially, especially in the case of feminines. This diphthong *ei* may also be reduced from *η*, or it may be occasioned by epenthesis, or it may arise from a prehistoric contraction in certain forms of the verb, as, 2d and 3d pers. sing., pres. and fut. ind. act. The author favors us with a theory of the 3d pers. sing. which is certainly original and striking: "*φέρει* ist *φερε-*, Nebenform zu *φερο-*, + *ι* Locativelement, also 'im tragen,' reines Infinitiv als 3 p. s. gebraucht." In discussing epenthesis he says: "Es ist undenkbar, dass das *ι* in *κρετjων* sowohl das *τ* in *σσ* umwandeln könnte, als auch die Kraft besässe, vorzuspringen."

With the correctness of the explanation offered for *κρείσσων* we are less concerned than with the view here indicated of the nature of epenthesis. Surely it is not unthinkable that epenthesis or umlaut may occur without the *ι* or *j* being removed from its original position. Has not Zend numbers of such forms as *vinçaiti*, Skr. *vinçati*; *navaitis*, Skr. *navati*? And, if this be true,

what is to hinder the remaining *i* or *j* from exerting a further influence on the consonant after which it stands? This is exactly what occurs in the West Germanic dialects in such cases as A.-S. **banjāz* > **benja* > *benna*; **satjan* > **setjan* > *settan*; **racjan* > **recjan* > *reccan*; and still more strikingly in Old Saxon *settian*, *reccian*.

The spurious diphthong is discussed under the following heads: First, *ei* from compensative lengthening; second, *ei* < *ε* under the ictus; third, *ei* derived from *ε* + an *i* developed in certain cases before vowels; fourth, *ei* arising from contraction of *εε*.

Dr. Smyth's treatise is a most welcome contribution to the scientific study of grammar, and shows the praiseworthy tendency of recent investigations to deal with minute points and collect, as far as possible, complete material as the only sure basis for satisfactory theories. A favorable review of Dr. Smyth's work by Gustav Meyer may be found in the *Berliner Wochenschrift*, 31 July, 1886.

J. H. K.

The Roots and Stems of Words in the Latin Language Explained and Illustrated with Examples. By JOHN WENTWORTH SANBORN, A. M. Albion, N. Y., Published by the Author, 1886.

This little pamphlet, of barely ten pages, is designed to throw light on the difference between roots and stems, and to furnish a guide to teachers and pupils. It seems to us to throw very little light, and often to lead astray. The writer's lack of sound linguistic training is everywhere evident. On the very first page we are told that the word *ēs-sē* has the root *ēs*, and this is also its stem. It is certainly time that a long-mark over a vowel should mean simply that the vowel itself is long. In *rex*, king, *rēg* is said to be the verbal root designating an *object*. Here the difference between *rēg* and *rēg* of *regere* is certainly not made clear. Nor is there much illumination in the following sentences: "A few examples of pronominal roots will illustrate: *mē* in *mei*, *tū* in *tuī*, and such remains of pronominal roots as *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, *ie*." "*Iūdicis* is such a word; its compounded roots are *in* and *dic* (from *ius* and *dico*)."
 "The stem of *principes* is *princeps*," "The root of *gēnu* is *gon*; the stem is *genu*." "The stem of *hic* is *hō*; if the enclitic *ne* is added *ce* (*cī*) appears; as *hiccine*." "The stem of *illē* is *illō*, or an old form *ollō*." Finally, the root of *bibo* is said to be *bo* or *bib*. In the face of these and other statements, which it is superfluous to mention here, we humbly beg leave to differ from the opinion of "several distinguished instructors," who, according to the writer's preface, examined the manuscript and thought it would prove "no sacrifice of thoroughness."

M. W.

Ovid, *Tristia*, Book I. The Text Revised, with an Introduction and Notes, by S. G. OWEN, B. A. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1885. Pp. lxiv, 115.

This book, as the editor announces, is only an instalment of a larger commentary on the complete *Tristia*, which is in preparation. It can hardly be denied that Ovid has received of late less attention from scholars than he deserves. Robinson Ellis has given us a learned edition of the *Ibis*, contributing much to its elucidation, and the idea of the edition before us seems to have been suggested by him. As the last commentary to the *Tristia* was that of